



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,981	12/11/2003	Toshihiko Munetsugu	32161US2	1257

116 7590 09/16/2008

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2008

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

In the “*Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter*” of the Appeal Brief, Appellant fails to provide a proper mapping the claimed invention to the Claims.

For example, **regarding independent claim 37:**

Appellant maps the claimed “*an input unit operable to input content description data*” to “*selection means discussed on page 16, lines 8-17; See also Fig. 20, interface means 2401 connected to database 1805, and selection means 1801, discussed on page 53, line 14 to line 3 of page 55*”.

Page 16, lines 8-17 states:

paragraphs from the chapter.

In the data processing device, the data processing method, the recording medium, and the program of the present invention, a score represents the degree of contextual importance of media content. So long as the score is set so as to select important scenes, a collection of important scenes of a program, for example, can be readily prepared.

Further, so long as the score is set so as to represent the importance of a scene of interest from the viewpoint of keyword, segments can be selected with a high degree of freedom by

The above cited portion, however, fails to suggest the claimed “*an input unit operable to input content description data*”. Fig. 20 does not include, interface means 2401 connected to database 1805, and selection means 1801. Also, page 53, line 14 to line 3 of page 55 discusses Figs. 36-38, not Fig. 20.

Appellant maps the claimed *“a plurality of segments each for describing one of said plurality of scenes of media content”* to *“Figs 2 discussed on page 30, lines 18-25”*. The Examiner notes that *page 30, lines 18-25* includes brief description of Figs. 123-125, and does not include discussion of Fig.2.

It is also noted that in the “*Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter*”

Appellant does not provide a complete mapping for the independent claims.

For example, Appellant does not map the following limitations of independent claim 47: *a plurality of segment elements each being a child of one of said section elements and also being associated with a corresponding one of said plurality of scenes; each being associated with one or more of said segment elements and/or section elements; each of said context attributes having a value for describing a context of said media content; each associated with a corresponding one of said segments for determining a start time and one of an end time; and a duration of the scene associated with said corresponding segment*. Appellant does not map the following limitations of independent claim 60: *a plurality of section elements each having either one or more of said plurality of section elements as children, or having one or more of said plurality of segment elements as children; and outputting one or more of said plurality of scenes based on the selected segment elements*.

Appellant is requested to review the entire "*Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter*" section and provide a proper and complete mapping for the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal.